

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,778,782). Claims 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,778,782) as applied to Claim 1, above, in further view of Oshima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,688,789). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

This rejection asserts that Ito discloses a transferable sheet comprising a substrate and a dye receptive layer on the substrate which comprises a core material and a synthetic paper provided on a front and a back surface of the core material. The This rejection further points out that the synthetic paper is white and opaque (col. 3, line 44). A detection mark is provided on the surface of the core material of the substrate (col. 18, line 17).

Independent Claim 1 of the present application recites “the identification mark being provided *between* said plurality of substrate sheets.” (emphasis added.) In

contrast, Ito discloses that the detection mark is provided on the surface of the core material of the substrate as described in claim 18 (col. 18, line 17) and preferably *on the back surface* (col. 9, line 20). It should also be noted that the detection mark disclosed in Ito is the one which is detectable with a photoelectric tube detecting device. This means that, if the detection mark were provided *between* the plurality of substrate sheets which are white or opaque (col. 3, line 44), then the detection mark would be optically concealed and therefore would not be detectable. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Ito does not include any disclosure or suggestion to provide the detection mark between the plurality of substrates as claimed. Oshima is not cited for this feature, and Applicants respectfully assert that Oshima does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in Claim 1, either alone or in combination with Ito. Since each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remaining claims are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2007

By: 
Michael E. Hilton
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jks